



**Paper: “A Research Review on the Global Refocusing on African Development: Challenges and Opportunities in 21st Century”**

Corresponding Author: Ignatius Nnaemeka Onwuatuegwu

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n20p129

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Vladutescu Stefan  
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer 2: Sharad Soni  
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 3: Gordana Stankovska  
University of Tetovo, Republic of Macedonia

Published: 31.07.2020

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Stefan Vladutescu	Email:
University/Country: Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 01.06.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 03.06.2020
Manuscript Title: GLOBAL REFOCUSING ON AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN 21ST CENTURY- A PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 64.04.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p><b>a) The introduction is incomplete and does not exploit a current and current knowledge fund; more precisely, scientific works from 2015 to, 2020 years are not discussed.</b></p> <p><b>In the introduction a literature review must be carried out.</b></p> <p><b>b) On page 5 of the manuscript I identified an unquoted excerpt from a book. I marked this on the manuscript.</b></p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>Are missing references from 2018-2020.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**